ROSETTI, LEANA

From: David Friedman dfriedman@ndep.nv.gov

Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 2:24 PM

To: Bain, Andrew W.

Subject: FW: SouthEast Connector (SPK-2010-01058) Updated information (UNCLASSIFIED)

Attachments: [EXTERNAL] USEPA Comments Technical Memo Mercury (SE Connector,

SPK-2010-01058) (UNCLASSIFIED).pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Completed

Andy-

I just spoke with Jean Stone who is in charge of our Section 401 Water Quality Certification for the SouthEast Connector project to find out where USACE is at. Jean says they are a long way from a decision yet based on several issues including mercury. Jean said that they have recently begun weekly Section 404 permit update calls with Kristine Hansen from USACE at the RTC's request and Jean said she is participating in these calls for NDEP. I think there has been one call thus far. Regarding Leana, coincidently when I went to Jean's desk she had an e-mail open from Kristine Hansen that forwarded her Region 9's comments (Chris Eckley) on the CH2MHill technical memo analyzing the potential for methylation of mercury in the proposed Steamboat Creek floodplain. (Those comments are attached to this e-mail). I read over these comments before forwarding this e-mail. It looks to me that Chris captured the same issues NDEP cited in this memo plus a couple more.

Sincerely, Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Jean Stone

Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 1:53 PM

To: David Friedman

Subject: FW: SouthEast Connector (SPK-2010-01058) Updated information (UNCLASSIFIED)

FYI

----Original Message----

From: Hansen, Kristine S SPK [mailto:Kristine.S.Hansen@usace.army.mil]

Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 1:25 PM

To: Jean Stone

Subject: FW: SouthEast Connector (SPK-2010-01058) Updated information (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Jean-

Here are the USEPA comments regarding the April 2014 Tech Memo.

Kristine Hansen

Senior Project Manager

US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District Reno Regulatory Field Office

300 Booth Street, Room 3050 Reno, Nevada 89509-1361

(775) 784-5304 (primary) -5307 (secondary) fax: (775) 784-5306

Kristine.S.Hansen@usace.army.mil

Customer Service Hours: M-F 9:00am-3:00pm

I will be available to answer phone calls, return phone calls and respond to e-mail during these hours.

We want your feedback! Take the survey: http://corpsmapu.usace.army.mil/cm apex/f?p=regulatory survey

Need information on the Regulatory Program? Visit our website: http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory.aspx

Facebook: www.facebook.com/sacramentodistrict

YouTube: www.youtube.com/sacramentodistrict

Twitter: www.twitter.com/USACESacramento

-----Original Message-----From: Hansen, Kristine S SPK

Sent: Friday, August 01, 2014 4:15 PM

To: 'Garth Oksol'

Subject: SouthEast Connector (SPK-2010-01058) Updated information (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Garth-

Please find below a discussion between Erin Hess and Bob Kautz regarding the PA development and next steps in the Cultural Resources review.

Attached is a copy of the Section 7, Endangered Species Act Consultation request letter.

In our meeting yesterday, it was discussed that an Excel version of the RTC's response to Public Notice comments would be provided to the Corps. This serves as a reminder of that request.

Also yesterday it was discussed that RTC was going to coordinate directly with NDEP (copy to the Corps) regarding the comments provided on the Mercury Sampling. I mentioned that I had received comments from USEPA. I am providing those comments to you for review and response.

Thank you

Kristine Hansen Senior Project Manager US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District Reno Regulatory Field Office 300 Booth Street, Room 3050 Reno, Nevada 89509-1361

(775) 784-5304 (primary) -5307 (secondary) fax: (775) 784-5306 Kristine.S.Hansen@usace.army.mil

Customer Service Hours: M-F 9:00am-3:00pm

I will be available to answer phone calls, return phone calls and respond to e-mail during these hours.

We want your feedback! Take the survey: http://corpsmapu.usace.army.mil/cm apex/f?p=regulatory survey

Need information on the Regulatory Program? Visit our website: http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory.aspx

Facebook: www.facebook.com/sacramentodistrict

YouTube: www.youtube.com/sacramentodistrict

Twitter: www.twitter.com/USACESacramento

-----Original Message-----From: Hess, Erin E SPK

Sent: Friday, August 01, 2014 3:46 PM

To: Bob Kautz

Cc: Hansen, Kristine S SPK

Subject: RE: where now? (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Hi Bob,

At least one section of the PA will address most of Michon's comments and requests regarding any unanticipated discoveries (preferably as an attachment to the PA, so it will be able to be modified as appropriate, without having to go through a full PA amendment procedure). Since this isn't an emergency project, I am hesitant to use the term 'emergency' in our documents. We prefer to call it an "Unanticipated Discovery Plan", but essentially the same thing you are referring to. I don't know that we'd be as detailed regarding some of the procedures Michon recommends, especially because the RSIC is not the only Tribe we are consulting with, but generally many of her recommendations could be included in a discovery plan.

Kris will be consulting with SHPO regarding comments on the revised testing plan. Once we have an approved testing plan, it will also be attached to the PA with procedures for further consultation with the various parties (SHPO, Tribe, etc.) once the plan is carried out (RSIC and Washoe did wish Tribal Monitors to be present during testing, so we'll discuss this further once we receive SHPO's comments on the plan). An ARPA permit from us is not required because the none of the testing will be on Federal lands.

Likely that Kris has a copy of the report.

So, here is how I see the PA is shaping up to be structured:

The PA itself will have statements regarding which resources were determined eligible, with SHPO concurrence, and which still need to be evaluated. It will also have statements regarding the known adverse effects, again with SHPO concurrence. (So, the final language for these statements is dependent upon the outcome of SHPO consultation.) The other administrative language you saw in the template PA I shared will be modified to fit the project as appropriate, including Tribal consultation statements.

· We'll have one attachment with appropriate maps (project boundary, locations of eligible resources, locations of resources to be tested)

Testing Plan as an attachment

Monitoring Plan as an attachment (will include both Tribal and Archaeological monitoring)

· Unanticipated Discovery Plan as an attachment (will include notification procedures, some potential treatment measures, but not necessarily anything too specific because we do not know what may be discovered)

The Corps will finish writing the PA. I have the draft Nikki was working on earlier, so am merging it with our template. We'll be asking you/RTC for the figures and attachments. (The proposed testing plan is currently being reviewed and receiving comments, so really the monitoring and discovery plan are the next two big items to tackle.)

Hope this answers your questions. Kris, did I miss anything?

Erin E. Hess

National Historic Preservation Act Compliance

Regulatory Division, Sacramento District

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

1325 J Street, Room 1350

Sacramento, California 95814

Phone: (916) 557-6740

Fax: (916) 557-7803

Customer Service Hours: M-F 9:00am-3:00pm

Please be aware phone calls and emails will be answered only during these hours.

We want your feedback! Take the survey: http://corpsmapu.usace.army.mil/cm apex/f?p=regulatory survey

Need information on the Regulatory Program? Visit our website: http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory.aspx

Facebook: www.facebook.com/sacramentodistrict

YouTube: www.youtube.com/sacramentodistrict

Twitter: www.twitter.com/USACESacramento

BUILDING STRONG®

From: Bob Kautz [mailto:kautz@kecnv.com] Sent: Friday, August 01, 2014 1:53 PM

To: Hess, Erin E SPK

Cc: <u>Cindy.Potter@CH2M.com</u>; <u>ken.greene@ch2m.com</u>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] where now?

Erin, Some questions that occur to me that you may be able to help with. First, upon consideration, it seems to me that the issues raised by the Michon Eben (RSIC) letter (July 28, 2014) would be best addressed by means of an "Emergency Discovery Plan," rather than as an aspect of the PA. Do you agree? Second, where are we relative to a testing plan to identify/locate and evaluate the several sites that require further attention? If the baseline report we submitted has been accepted by you and NSHPO, does this mean that the Testing Plan that was appended to that report is acceptable? If so, would the next step be to obtain an ARPA permit to conduct the activities necessary to implement that plan? If so, should I submit the ARPA permit application to you?? Do you have a copy of the ethnohistoric report Ms. Eben mentions in her letter entitled, "The People and Places of Truckee Meadows: An Ethnohistory of a Portion of the Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project, Washoe County, Nevada"? That report was submitted to your office in 2011. I understand things may be moving up here for this project and I am just trying to anticipate your needs and my client's (RTC) needs. Thank you for your help. Bob

Robert R. Kautz, Ph.D.

Kautz Environmental Consultants, Inc.

1140 Financial Blvd., Ste. 100

Reno, NV 89502

(775) 829-4411

(775) 829-6161 (fax)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE